

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23, 46-56, 82 and 83 are pending in this application. All claims have been rejected.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 10-13, and 46-51 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response independent Claims 1 and 46 have been amended and are now directed to methods performed over a network of a plurality of computing devices. Such methods comply with the statutory requirements. Claims 2, 10-13, and 47-51 depend from Claims 1 and 46 respectively.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-23, 46-56, and 82-83 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the claim language does not explain how to carry out the preamble stipulation. In response Independent Claims 1, 14, 46, 52, and 82 were amended to include language that points out what is accomplished by the elements recited in each independent claim. Claims 1, 14, 46, 52, and 82 are respectively directed to “a method for developing inventions by a plurality of inventors”; “a system for developing inventions by a plurality of inventors”; and “a method of providing invention development services of a plurality of inventors”; “a method of providing for fee invention development services of a plurality of inventors”; “a computer system for developing inventions by a plurality of inventors”, respectively. Elements of these claims are directed to explaining how a plurality of inventors are pooled together, and, finally, all these claims culminate in a statement “wherein said co-inventors in said pool develop the invention described in the proposal for invention”. This, therefore particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter of these claims, which is seeking out inventors and facilitating their online collaboration for the purpose of developing inventions.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-13 and 46-56, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for omitting essential elements. In view of the claim amendments and the discussion above, applicants believe that Claims 1-13 and 46-56 as amended now overcome the §112, second paragraph rejection.

The Examiner further rejected Claims 1-13 and 46-56 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,583,763 (Atcheson). The Examiner similarly rejected Claims 14-23 and 82-83 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Atcheson.

Atcheson describes a system for determining selections that a user is likely to be interested in. The determination is made based on the user's prior indicated preferences. The user designates his or her preferred selections as entries in a user's preference list.

Atcheson does not describe the claimed teaching of the present invention, which is directed to seeking out and pooling inventors having qualities, e.g., skills and education most appropriate for complementing qualities, e.g., skills and education, of other inventors involved in developing a specific invention. Furthermore, Atcheson does not describe the claimed teaching of the present invention regarding facilitating online collaboration of the pooled inventors for the purpose of developing inventions.

In view of the claim amendments and the discussion above, it is clear that Atcheson does not teach or describe any of "a method for developing inventions by a plurality of inventors"; "a system for developing inventions by a plurality of inventors"; "a method of providing invention development services of a plurality of inventors"; "a method of providing for fee invention development services of a plurality of inventors"; and "a computer system for developing inventions by a plurality of inventors", "wherein said co-inventors in said pool develop the invention described in the proposal for invention" recited in independent Claims 1, 14, 46, 52, and 82 as amended.

Applicants believe that the amendment of independent Claims 1, 14, 46, 52, and 82 described above, places these claims in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent 2-13, 15-23, 47-51, 53-56, and 83, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-23, 46-56, 82 and 83, are believed to be in condition for allowance, reconsideration, and withdrawal of the rejections of these Claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would

facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", is written over a horizontal line.

Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484